



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/268,254	03/15/1999	ANTONIUS H.M. HOLTSLAG	PHN-17.049	8145

7590

05/28/2002

ALGY TAMOSHUNAS  
CORPORATE PATENT COUNSEL  
U S PHILIPS CORPORATION  
580 WHITE PLAINS ROAD  
TARRYTOWN, NY 10591

EXAMINER

KOVALICK, VINCENT E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2673

DATE MAILED: 05/28/2002

16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Ne



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

MAILED  
MAY 28 2002  
Technology Center 2600

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

Paper No. 16

Application Number: 09/268,254

Filing Date: March 15, 1999

Appellant(s): H. M. Holtslag

---

Edward W. Goodman

For Appellant

Art Unit: 2673

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed April 18, 2002.

**(1) *Real Party of Interest***

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences***

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

**(3) *Status of Claims***

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) *Status of Amendments After Final***

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Invention**

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Issues**

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

**(7) Grouping of Claims**

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 1-5 stand and fall together.

**(8) Claims Appealed**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(9) Prior Art of Record**

**4,562,463**

**Lipton**

**12-1985**

**(10) Grounds of Rejection**

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). This rejection is set forth in prior Office Action, Paper No. 9.

**(11) Response to Argument**


*Appellant argues that "the Lipton television system only deals with processing of the video signal and does not address how this video signal is to be applied to the different display lines (i.e., plasma channels) of a plasma display panel; (page 6, last paragraph of the brief).*

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Though Lipton (U.S. 4,562,463) primarily teaches a CRT display means for displaying a video signal, Lipton further teach that the display could also be a plasma display panel (col. 13, lines 48-59). Still further Lipton teaches the means for alternating a repeated video signal in an odd-odd-even-even manner indicating that the odd display lines are addressed consecutively


more than one time, with means included in the system for then switching to display an imaged on the even display lines more than one consecutive times (col.14, lines 24-31). The "odd" and "even" lines correspond to the odd and even plasma channels (display lines) of a PDP.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Vincent E. Kovalick  
May 21, 2002


Conferees:

Mark Zimmerman 

MARK ZIMMERMAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

  
Amare Mengistu

Edward W. Goodman  
U S Philips Corp.  
580 White Plains Road  
Tarrytown NY 10591  
(914) 333-9611

  
BIPIN SHALWALA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600